

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending. By this Amendment, Claims 1-11 are amended to enhance grammatical structure. The specification is also amended.

Applicants note that the last reference on the Form PTO-1449 that was filed in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office with an Information Disclosure Statement on 22 May 2001, has not yet been considered by the Examiner. This reference, authored by Ulrich Pilger and titled "Struktur des DECT-Standards", was cited in a German Search report issued in connection with a counterpart foreign application. A copy of the German Search Report was filed with the Information Disclosure Statement. The German Search Report classified the Pilger reference as a "Y" reference that is particularly relevant if combined with another document of the same category. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has all information necessary to formally consider the Pilger reference. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to return a copy of the Form PTO-1449 with the next Office Action, initialed to indicate that the Pilger reference has been officially considered and made of record.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the specification obviate this objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 7 satisfies all requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. In particular, Applicant notes that the specification discloses GPS (Global Positioning System) as a source for time, in particular Universal Time (see for example page 3, line 29), and discloses also "local time"

(see for example page 2, line 29; and page 4, line 4). As a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized, local time refers to time at a particular locale, for example in the U.S. Virginia is in the Eastern Time Zone while California is in the Pacific Time Zone, whereas the time provided by the GPS receiver is Coordinated Universal Time (Zulu or Greenwich Mean Time, GMT). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 7 is definite. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-5, 8 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,600,758 to Mazur, *et al.* (Mazur) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,469,990 to Raaf (Raaf). The Examiner also rejects Claims 6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Mazur and Raaf in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735,222 to Kingdon, *et al.* (Kingdon). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Mazur and Raaf each disclose using a synchronization burst or packet to time-synchronize units in a wireless communication system. See for example Mazur at Column 8, lines 26-28 and Raaf at Column 7, line 30.

Mazur also considers time-synchronized systems having discontinuous control channel carriers. See e.g. Mazur at Column 8, lines 31-35. However, Mazur's additional disclosure in this respect is directed to estimations performed by a mobile station, based for example on propagation delay. In particular, Mazur discloses a mobile station calculating when to open a measurement window to make signal strength measurements on neighboring base stations, based on knowledge of propagation delay. See e.g. Mazur at Column 9, lines 63-66. Mazur also discloses estimating a real time difference due to propagation delay between neighboring base

stations, and then using this estimate in the mobile to help determine when to open the measurement window. See .g. Mazur at Column 10, lines 28-35. In addition, Mazur discloses a mobile station making an estimate of an absolute time reference that it can then to help determine when to open the measurement window. See e.g. Mazur at Column 11, lines 7-21.

However, Mazur and Raaf, when considered both separately and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest using a *time interval between* signals to clock or synchronize units. In particular, Mazur and Raaf fail to disclose or suggest a method for time synchronization of units in a system which has a timebase unit which is connected via a deterministic communications network to the units, with the timebase unit transmitting protocol packets via the deterministic communications network to the units at a defined time interval, which units receive the protocol packets and *use the time interval between the received protocol packets for at least approximately identical clocking of the units*, as recited in Claim 1.


Applicants respectfully submit that Kingdon fails to overcome the deficiencies of Mazur and Raaf described above. Accordingly, the asserted combination of Mazur, Raaf and Kingdon fails to disclose the present claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration on the merits and prompt allowance are respectfully requested. In the event any questions arise regarding this communication or the application in general, please contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: 05 November 2004

By: 
M. David Ream
Registration No. 35,333

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620